

**Selection of Award  
RFP: NNS10315511R  
Bldg. 4995 Second Floor Renovation  
February 22, 2010**

**PROCUREMENT HISTORY:**

The NASA John C. Stennis Space Center (SSC) is located in Hancock County, MS. A need has been identified to renovate the second floor of Building 4995. Building 4995 is located at Stennis Space Center, Mississippi. The work includes but is not limited to the following: purchasing and installing a raised floor, installing and activating a sprinkler system, installing an Uninterruptible Power Supply and the associated electrical systems, installing duct work and balancing the HVAC system, installing and finishing a bathroom, installing and finishing interior walls, installing acoustical ceiling, and sealing the passageways under the floor for fire rating. The demolition for this job will be completed by others before the start of the job. The work is further defined in the Specifications and Drawings.

Building 4995 is scheduled to support the A Complex at SSC. Renovation of the second floor of Building 4995 is necessary to meet current code requirements and to provide space for program support personnel and other functions.

A synopsis was posted on October 19, 2009 on the NASA Acquisition Internet Service (NAIS) Business Opportunities and Federal Business Opportunities (FedBizOps) websites. The Request for Proposal was issued on November 10, 2009, and proposals were due no later than December 18, 2009.

This procurement is being conducted utilizing Best Value Selection (BVS), which seeks to select an offer based on the best combination of price and qualitative merit (including past performance and relevant experience) of the offers submitted and reduce the administrative burden on the offerors and the Government. BVS predefines the value characteristics that will serve as the discriminators among offers and is based on the premise that, if all offers are of approximately equal qualitative merit, award will be made to the offeror with the lowest evaluated price (fixed-price contracts). However, the Government will consider awarding to an offeror with higher qualitative merit if the difference in price is commensurate with added value. Conversely, the Government will consider making award to an offeror whose offer has lower qualitative merit if the price differential between it and other offers warrant doing so.

The award will be made to the responsible offeror whose proposal is responsive and offers the best value to the Government. Best value will be determined based on an integrated assessment of each proposal in terms of past performance, relevant experience, and price. Therefore, subjective judgment by the Government is implicit in the evaluation process. **Past performance is of equal importance to relevant experience, but when combined, these factors are significantly more important than price.** However, if an offeror does not have relevant past performance history, the offeror may not be evaluated favorably or unfavorably on past performance and will be given a neutral rating as detailed in this plan. In addition, award may be made to the other than low-priced offer and may be made without conducting discussions.

The solicitation closed on December 18, 2009, and the initial review was conducted on the proposals received.

### **FINDINGS:**

A total of nineteen (19) proposals were received in response to this Request for Proposal (RFP). In accordance with the evaluation process outlined in the RFP, all offerors were evaluated to determine if all required information was provided.

Three (3) of the 19 proposals were considered non-responsive as noted below:

The proposal submitted by BMCI Construction, LLC failed to include an acceptable bid bond as required by FAR Clause 52.228-1 and NASA FAR Supplement (NFS) Clause 1852.228-73. The bid bond submitted did not contain an original signature for the corporate surety, did not contain corporate seals for the principal nor the corporate surety, and the power-of-attorney document was photo-copied. Failure to furnish a proper bid bond prior to the time set for submission of proposals rendered the proposal as non-responsive.

The proposal submitted by Firewatch Contracting of Florida, LLC failed to include a bid bond as required by NFS Clause 1852.228-73. A bid bond was simply not furnished with their proposal. Failure to furnish a proper bid bond prior to the time set for submission of proposals rendered the proposal as non-responsive.

The proposal submitted by TL Services, Inc. failed to include an acceptable bid bond as required by FAR Clause 52.228-1 and NASA FAR Supplement (NFS) Clause 1852.228-73. The bid bond submitted did not state the penal sum of the bond (20%) on the front page of the Standard Form 24. Failure to furnish a proper bid bond prior to the time set for submission of proposals rendered the proposal as non-responsive.

The remaining sixteen (16) offerors submitted all the required documentation, and were forwarded to the technical evaluation team for evaluation under Step Two of the evaluation process. During the initial phases of evaluation under Step 2, the technical personnel only received the offerors' past performance and relevant experience sections of the proposals. The pricing portion was evaluated by procurement and technical personnel after completion of the initial technical evaluation in order to provide an unbiased (pricing perspective) technical review (e.g., so the technical evaluators would not potentially be influenced by having knowledge of the price before providing their technical reviews).

The evaluation team prepared a summary of their findings utilizing the best value process as described in the solicitation. As a result of the technical evaluation, it was determined that the evaluation team clearly understood the offerors' proposals and there was no requirement for clarifications or discussions with regard to the technical evaluation.

In compliance with the past performance, relevant experience, and price analysis criteria established in the RFP, the evaluation team evaluated the offerors and the results are listed

below. The table below provides an overview of the evaluation results and the ratings for each responsive contractor:

<b><u>Company</u></b>	<b><u>Past Performance Rating</u></b>	<b><u>Relevant Experience Rating (Risk)</u></b>
ADONAI Contracting, Inc.	Above Average	Low
Affiliated Western, Inc.	Neutral	High
American Patriot Construction, Inc.	Outstanding	Low
Coburn Contractors, LLC	Outstanding	Low
DC General, LLC-DC General Contractors, Inc. (JV)	Above Average	Low
Faulk & Meek General Contractors, LLC	Outstanding	Low
GibsonCase Construction, LLC (JV)	Above Average	Low
Innovative Builders and 03 (JV)	Outstanding	Low
Integrated Pro Services, LLC	Outstanding	Moderate
IronBridge Construction, Inc.	Outstanding	Low
Multi-Con, Inc.	Above Average	Moderate
Polu Kai Services, LLC	Outstanding	Low
SDVE, LLC	Outstanding	Low
Seymour-Schatzle, LLC	Above Average	Moderate
Smith Building Group, Inc.	Above Average	Low
US Builders Group	Above Average	Low

#### **PAST PERFORMANCE:**

The solicitation required offerors to provide information on relevant past contracts, preferably with the Government, (using Attachment F of the solicitation), listing contract number, contract value, agency name and point of contact (including address, telephone and fax numbers, and e-mail address, if available), what the contract was for, and status of the contract (current, terminated (if so, why), successfully completed). Offerors were also required to provide past performance documentation of their major subcontractors they intend on using for this project. The solicitation further states the evaluation will be based on information obtained from references provided by the offeror (Attachment F), as well as other past performance information obtained from other sources known by the government (e.g., Past Performance Database) or any other source that may have useful and relevant information. The possible ratings for past performance were Outstanding, Above Average, Neutral, Satisfactory, Marginal, and Unsatisfactory. The evaluation team assigned each contractor a rating for Past Performance as follows:

### **Adonai Contracting, Inc: Past Performance Overall – Above Average**

Adonai Contracting and its subcontractors provided past performance information for several projects. One respondent stated that Adonai has established working relationships with quality subcontractors. Respondents rated Adonai and their subcontractor as either outstanding or above average, with more above average ratings than outstanding. Past performance sources stated that Adonai completed their projects on time and they were proactive in finding solutions to problems that arose. Respondents were extremely pleased with their performance and would willingly do business with this firm in the future. Based on the above information, and in accordance with the solicitation criteria, the overall past performance for Adonai Contracting, Inc. was considered to be above average.

### **Affiliated Western, Inc. Past Performance Overall - Neutral**

Affiliated Western did not provide any record of past performance to evaluate. Based on the lack of information, and in accordance with the solicitation criteria, the contractor receives a neutral for past performance.

### **American Patriot Construction: Past Performance Overall - Outstanding**

American Patriot Construction provided past performance information for them and for another entity having the same corporate officers. IAW the solicitation, section M.1, (a) second paragraph past performance of the company's principal owner(s) or corporate officer(s) may be considered. Respondents stated that the contractor does electrical and mechanical work and are a real quality contractor with an outstanding end product. References also stated their scheduling and program management is excellent and that the owner is very intelligent, capable and a great contractor. The respondents stated they definitely will use them again. Respondents stated they have a very good safety program with no troubles at all. Based on the above information, and in accordance with the solicitation criteria, the overall past performance for American Patriot Construction was considered as outstanding.

### **Coburn Constructors: Past Performance Overall - Outstanding**

The past performance information provided for Coburn Constructors and their proposed subcontractors were reviewed and respondents indicated that performance was excellent and timely. Comments received indicated that the contractor was superior, reactive to change without objection; and we would not be disappointed with their performance. It was noted that Coburn Constructors managed their subcontractors well and that there were no safety or quality issues identified. Based on the above information and in accordance with the solicitation criteria, the overall past performance for Coburn Constructors was considered outstanding.

**DC General, LLC-DC General Contractors Joint Venture:  
Past Performance Overall - Above Average**

DC General, LLC-DC General Contractors is a joint venture between DC General, LLC and DC General Contractors, Inc. DC General Contractors (DCGC) submitted several projects for review which included projects similar in scope and complexity. Respondents stated DC General Contractors performed above average with no major safety problems. DC General did a good job managing their subcontractors, and was interested in pleasing the customer. All sources contacted indicated they would willingly do business with DCGC in the future. There are no indications of any major safety violations. Based on the above information, and in accordance with the solicitation criteria, the overall past performance for DC General, LLC-DC General Contractors was considered as above average.

**Faulk and Meek General Contractors, LLC: Past Performance Overall – Outstanding**

Faulk and Meek and its subcontractors provided past performance information for several projects. One reference stated that Faulk and Meek is an excellent contractor with good subcontractors. References further stated that they work proactively to resolve problems and they would definitely do business with them again. Respondents rated Faulk and Meek and their subcontractor as either outstanding or above average, with more outstanding ratings than above average. There are no indications of any major safety violations. Based on the information above and in accordance with the solicitation criteria, the overall past performance for Faulk and Meek General Contractors, LLC was considered as outstanding.

**GibsonCase Construction, LLC Joint Venture: Past Performance Overall – Above Average**

GibsonCase Construction, LLC is a joint venture between Gibson Quality Support Group, LLC and Case Construction, LLC. The past performance information provided by GibsonCase and their proposed subcontractors was reviewed. Comments received indicate the contractor provides a quality product, coordinates well with other contractors, and works to provide alternative solutions to solve problems providing economical solutions. They have performed several projects with different agencies; each indicated excellent project management capabilities. Respondents rated GibsonCase Construction and their subcontractors as either outstanding or above average, with more above average ratings than outstanding. There have been no indications of any major safety violations. Based on the above information and in accordance with the solicitation criteria, the overall past performance for GibsonCase Construction, LLC was considered to be above average.

**Innovative Builders and 03, A Joint Venture: Past Performance Overall – Outstanding**

Innovative Builders and 03 and its subcontractors provided past performance information for several projects. Comments received from the references provided indicated the contractor is hard working and provided a high quality product. Additional past performance information was obtained from a database and this information indicated the contractor received an overall outstanding rating on that project and that the contractor's quality of work consistently exceeded requirements, they did an excellent job managing subcontractors, and an excellent job working

with safety inspectors. There are no indications of any major safety violations. Based on the above information and in accordance with the solicitation criteria, the overall past performance for Innovative Builders and 03, and their proposed subcontractors was considered as outstanding.

#### **Integrated Pro Services, LLC: Past Performance Overall – Outstanding**

Integrated Pro Services provided past performance information. One past performance reference stated that their project manager and superintendent have been amazing. Comments received indicate that communication is very good and that the contractor provides suggestions on accomplishing the job easier and with savings. Comments received also indicate that the contractor is very good at managing their subcontractors and they are very knowledgeable and competent in their fields. The source indicated they would definitely do business with them again. There are no indications of any major safety violations. Based on the above information and in accordance with the solicitation criteria, the overall past performance for Integrated Pro Services, LLC was considered as outstanding.

#### **IronBridge Construction: Past Performance Overall – Outstanding**

IronBridge Construction and its subcontractors provided past performance information for several projects. Comments received indicated the contractor has performed well and does quality work. Comments received further indicated they operated with innovative methods to reduce project total cost, they go the extra mile to ensure the project is done right, and they have a “whatever it takes” attitude. There are no indications of any major safety violations. Based on the above information and in accordance with the solicitation criteria, the overall past performance for Iron Bridge Construction was considered as outstanding.

#### **Multi-Con, Inc.: Past Performance Overall - Above Average**

Multi-Con, Inc. submitted several projects for review. Multi-Con has performed on numerous small electrical type projects for the federal government, universities, schools, churches, and other commercial entities. Respondents indicated that they have been very positive throughout the project. Respondents further indicated Multi-Con’s performance was acceptable and they would not hesitate to consider Multi-Con for routine commercial building modifications. Based on the above information, and in accordance with the solicitation criteria, the overall past performance for Multi-Con, Inc was considered as above average.

#### **Polu Kai Services, LLC: Past Performance Overall – Outstanding**

The past performance information provided by Polu Kai Services was reviewed. Comments received indicate the contractor did an outstanding job managing its subcontractors, is familiar with working with the government and is very knowledgeable about the codes and regulations and was timely with submittals which were of very high quality. One reference stated all problems identified on any project were promptly corrected without question. References further stated the contractor is very attentive to safety including conducting daily safety meetings. One project required a lot of coordination among several people and the coordination went very well. All punch list items were completed in a timely manner and there were no problems with the

work. There are no indications of any major safety violations. Based on the above information and in accordance with the solicitation criteria, the overall past performance for Polu Kai Services, LLC was considered as outstanding rating.

#### **SDVE, LLC: Past Performance Overall - Outstanding**

SDVE, LLC submitted several projects for review which were similar in size, scope and complexity. Respondents stated SDVE was an outstanding company. They have worked numerous projects with a referenced agency and that agency is very happy with their performance. References stated the contractor is very professional, knowledgeable, and they provide fair and competitive pricing. References further stated that the contractor is extremely conscious of safety including infection control. All sources contacted indicated they would willingly do business with SDVE in the future. There are no indications of any major safety violations. Based on the above information, and in accordance with the solicitation criteria, the overall past performance for SDVE, LLC was considered outstanding.

#### **Seymour-Schatzle, LLC: Past Performance Overall – Above Average**

The past performance information provided by Seymour-Schatzle and their proposed subcontractor was reviewed. Comments received indicate the contractor is very responsive and attentive and that they are very professional and communicative; however, the respondent indicated that at times he had to guide the contractor and provide them with additional information to help the contractor along in doing their job, and indicated their overall performance was satisfactory. Their proposed subcontractor has performed several projects at Stennis Space Center where their performance was rated as either Outstanding or Above Average. There were minor safety issues identified; however, there were no major safety violations identified on any project. The outstanding and above average past performance ratings for the subcontractor did not warrant an overall outstanding rating for Seymour-Schatzle, LLC. Based on the above information, the overall past performance for Seymour-Schatzle, LLC was considered as Above Average.

#### **Smith Building Group, Inc.: Past Performance Overall – Above Average**

Smith Building Group provided numerous past performance information. It was noted in Smith Building's proposal that the corporate officers for Smith Building are also the corporate officers for another construction company included in their proposal. IAW the solicitation, section M.1, (a) second paragraph past performance of the company's principal owner(s) or corporate officer(s) may be considered. Smith Building Group and its subcontractors provided past performance information for numerous remodeling and renovation projects. A few comments received indicated their performance was exceptional, they are easy to work with, and they would definitely hire them again. It was noted that there were some minor safety incidents. One of the subcontractor's references was contacted, and they indicated the subcontractor delivered a quality product and they followed safety policies and OSHA regulations. However the reference also indicated they had to stay on this subcontractor throughout the performance period to enforce the safety standards. Most references contacted indicated they were reasonable to deal with, have a good safety program with no known major safety incidents. Respondents

rated the past performance for Smith Building Group and their subcontractors as Satisfactory, Above Average, or Outstanding, with the majority of respondents rating them above average. Based on the above information, and in accordance with the solicitation criteria, the overall past performance for Smith Building Group, Inc and their proposed subcontractors was considered to be Above Average.

#### **US Builders Group, Inc.: Past Performance Overall – Above Average**

The past performance information provided by US Builders Group was reviewed. Comments received indicate the contractor went above and beyond the requirements at times, benefiting the government. Comments further indicate that when a problem arose, the contractor would address it quickly, and at times they found problems and were proactive about the solutions. They were very good at managing their subcontractor, and they adjusted very well to schedule changes and were very accommodating with outages. One reference gave high marks for workmanship and quality. Another reference stated that their submittals were prompt and efficiently submitted, and that they would work with them again. Punch list items were completed satisfactorily and in a timely manner. Another reference indicated that during their project, they experienced 19 days of record setting rainfall, but the contractor was still able to finish the job on schedule. There are no indications of any major safety violations. Based on the above information and in accordance with the solicitation criteria, the overall past performance for US Builders was considered as above average.

#### **RELEVANT EXPERIENCE:**

In accordance with the evaluation process outlined in Section M of the solicitation, relevant experience is the accomplishment of work that is comparable or related to the technical work required by this solicitation, and is of similar scope, size and complexity. The possible ratings for relevant experience were Low, Moderate, or High Risk. The evaluation team assigned the following ratings for the relevant experience:

#### **Adonai Contracting, Inc: Relevant Experience – Low Risk**

Past performance information submitted indicates the contractor and their proposed subcontractors have extensive experience with jobs of similar size, scope, and complexity. Experience was shown with commercial and residential projects, as well as government projects. Based on the information provided little doubt exist that the offeror can satisfactory perform this kind of work and their experience was considered a low risk.

#### **Affiliated Western, Inc. Relevant Experience - High**

Affiliated Western did not provide any record of past performance which would identify their experience. Based on the lack of information, significant doubt exists that the offeror can satisfactorily perform this kind of work; therefore, Affiliated Western, Inc. received a high risk rating for relevant experience.



**American Patriot Construction: Relevant Experience - Low Risk**

The past performance projects submitted by American Patriot Construction demonstrate that they have extensive experience very similar in size, scope and complexity. Based on the information provided, little doubt exists that the offeror can satisfactorily perform this kind of work, and their experience was considered a low risk.

**Coburn Constructors: Relevant Experience – Low Risk**

Coburn Constructors and their proposed subcontractors have extensive experience working projects of similar size, scope and complexity. They are accustomed to government contracting processes and their in-house personnel are capable of performing schedule events in critical path. Based on the relevant experience information provided for Coburn Constructors, little doubt exists they can satisfactorily perform this kind of work, and their experience was considered a low risk.

**DC General, LLC-DC General Contractors Joint Venture: Relevant Experience – Low Risk**

The projects submitted by DC General Contractors (DCGC) for review clearly demonstrate that they have the extensive experience very similar in size, scope and complexity. DCGC has extensive experience similar to the work required in the solicitation. Based on the relevant experience information provided, little doubt exists the offeror can satisfactorily perform this kind of work, and their experience was considered a low risk.

**Faulk and Meek General Contractors, LLC: Relevant Experience – Low Risk**

Past performance records indicate the contractor has extensive experience with similar projects. The proposed subcontractors augment the experience of the prime contractor in critical skills. Based on the experience submitted for the offeror and their proposed subcontractors, little doubt exists the offeror can satisfactorily perform the kind of work required for this project, and their experience was considered a low risk.

**GibsonCase Construction, LLC Joint Venture: Relevant Experience – Low Risk**

GibsonCase Construction is a newly formed Joint Venture. Gibson Quality has little relevant experience in projects of the same scope and complexity. However, Case Construction has extensive relevant experience. Case Construction's previous work has been mostly on commercial projects. Case Construction has extensive experience with these types of projects. The experience of GibsonCase combined with the experience of their proposed subcontractor leave little doubt that the offeror can satisfactorily perform this kind of work and their experience was considered a low risk.

### **Innovative Builders and 03, A Joint Venture: Relevant Experience – Low Risk**

The projects submitted by Innovative Builders and 03 demonstrate they have extensive experience working on projects of similar size and scope. Based on the relevant experience information provided, little doubt exists the offeror can satisfactorily perform this kind of work, and their experience was considered a low risk.

### **Integrated Pro Services, LLC: Relevant Experience – Moderate Risk**

Information provided indicates Integrated Pro Services has limited experience with projects of similar size, scope and complexity. Integrated Pro Services only submitted one project for evaluation for work they performed on a greenhouse. Experience identified is not similar to skills required of this project. Based on their relevant experience information provided, some doubt exists that the offeror can satisfactorily perform this kind of work, and their experience warrants a moderate risk rating.

### **IronBridge Construction: Relevant Experience – Low Risk**

The projects submitted by IronBridge demonstrate they have extensive experience working on numerous projects of similar size, scope, and complexity. Based on the relevant experience information provided, little doubt exists the offeror can satisfactorily perform this kind of work, and their experience was considered a low risk.

### **Multi-Con, Inc.: Relevant Experience - Moderate Risk**

Past performance records submitted show numerous small projects that are mostly electrical-type work. Limited demonstrated experience in mechanical and other trades was identified. Multi-con showed limited experience in projects of similar size and scope. Base on the relevant experience information provided, some doubt exists that the offeror can satisfactorily perform this kind of work, and their experience was considered a moderate risk.

### **Polu Kai Services, LLC: Relevant Experience – Low Risk**

The past performance records submitted for this contractor demonstrate the Offeror's high degree of relevant experience. Based on the relevant experience information provided, there is little doubt the offeror can satisfactorily perform this kind of work, and their experience was considered a low risk.

### **SDVE, LLC: Relevant Experience – Low Risk**

The projects submitted by SDVE for review demonstrate that they have extensive experience in projects similar in size, scope and complexity. SDVE has experience dealing with the Government on renovation projects as well as design build projects. Based on the relevant

experience information provided little doubt exist that the offeror can satisfactory perform this kind of work and their experience was considered a low risk.

**Seymour-Schatzle, LLC: Relevant Experience – Moderate Risk**

The projects submitted by Seymour-Schatzle indicate they have very little experience in projects of similar size, scope, and complexity, while the proposed subcontractor has extensive experience in projects of similar size, scope, and complexity. The low risk of the proposed subcontractor offsets the high risk of Seymour-Schatzle's experience. Based on the relevant experience information provided, some doubt exists that the offeror can satisfactorily perform this kind of work, and their overall experience was considered a moderate risk.

**Smith Building Group, Inc.: Relevant Experience – Low Risk**

The projects submitted by Smith Building and their proposed subcontractors, demonstrate they have extensive experience in projects similar in size, scope and complexity. Respondents indicated that good relationships exist with the local suppliers and subcontractors which also help to reduce the risk. Based on the relevant experience information provided little doubt exist that the offeror can satisfactory perform this kind of work and their experience was considered a low risk.

**US Builders Group, Inc.: Relevant Experience – Low Risk**

The projects submitted by US Builders Group demonstrate they have extensive experience working on projects of similar size, scope, and complexity. Based on the relevant experience information provided, little doubt exist that the offeror can satisfactorily perform this kind of work, and their experience was considered a low risk.

**PRICE EVALUATION:**

In accordance with the solicitation and FAR 15.404-1(a)(1), the Contracting Officer is responsible for evaluating the reasonableness of the offered prices. The analytical techniques and procedures described in subject reference were utilized during the price analysis evaluation. Specifically, FAR 15.404-1(b)(2)(i) and FAR 15.404-1(b)(2)(v) were used to determine price reasonableness of the proposed prices.

In an effort to compare proposed prices to establish a basis for fair and reasonableness, we compared prices of all offerors. There were a total of 16 responsive proposals submitted in response to the solicitation. Prices ranged from the lowest price offer of \$999,192.00 to the highest price offer of \$2,547,160.00, with the Government estimate of \$1,474,561.00. Fourteen (14) proposals were less than the government estimate, and two (2) proposals were higher than the government estimate. It was noted that the lowest priced offer is \$475,369.00 less than the Government estimate and the highest priced offer is \$1,072,599.00 higher than the Government estimate. The average price submitted was \$1,288,268.66, which is \$186,292.34 less than the Government estimate. The prices submitted by all offerors were very competitive and increased gradually from the low offeror up to the Government estimate. The two highest price offerors

exceeded the Government estimate by a greater figure than those that fell below the Government estimate. Based on the competitive prices received, an award to any of the highest rated offerors would be considered fair and reasonable.

### **SELECTION DECISION:**

This procurement is being conducted utilizing Best Value Selection (BVS), which seeks to select an offer based on the best combination of price and qualitative merit (including past performance and relevant experience) of the offers submitted and reduce the administrative burden on the Offerors and the Government. BVS predefines the value characteristics that will serve as the discriminators among offers and is based on the premise that, if all offers are of approximately equal qualitative merit, award will be made to the offeror with the lowest evaluated price.

In accordance with the evaluation process outlined in Section M of the solicitation, the award will be made to the responsible offeror whose proposal is responsive and offers the best value to the Government. Best value will be determined based on an integrated assessment of each proposal in terms of past performance, relevant experience, and price. Therefore, subjective judgment by the Government is implicit in the evaluation process. As defined in the solicitation and FAR 15.101-1, the following trade-offs between cost or price and non-cost factors were used in this trade-off determination: **Past performance is of equal importance to relevant experience, but when combined, these factors are significantly more important than price.**


Before making my selection, I looked at the selection criteria to determine the importance of the price and the non-priced factors. As stated in the solicitation, past performance is of equal importance to relevant experience, but when combined, these factors are significantly more important than price. Because the non-priced factors were significantly more important than price, I first looked at all offerors ratings and compared the ratings to see who the highest rated offeror was. I found seven of the sixteen offerors received the highest possible ratings (outstanding past performance and low risk for relevant experience). One offeror received an outstanding past performance with a moderate risk for relevant experience. Five offerors received an above average past performance with a low risk for relevant experience. Two offerors had an above average past performance with a moderate risk for relevant experience. One offeror received a neutral for past performance with a high risk for relevant experience. I then looked to see if any of the highest rated offerors submitted the lowest price. I found that one of the highest rated offerors submitted the third lowest price.

Next, I looked at the lower priced offerors to see what ratings they received. I saw that the lowest price offeror received an above average which is the second highest rating possible for past performance and a moderate risk for experience, which is also the second highest rating. The past performance records for the lowest price offeror indicated that at times the contractor had to be guided and provided with additional information to help the contractor along in doing their job. There were some minor safety issues identified, and the projects submitted for the prime contractor were not similar to the work being performed. I noticed that the lowest price offer was only \$57,438.35 less than a highest rated offeror. Based on our selection criteria, I did not see a significant savings to warrant awarding to the offeror who received a lower rating for both past performance and relevant experience; therefore, I continued to look at the second lowest price to determine if they would provide a better value for the government.

The second lowest price offeror received an above average past performance rating which is the second highest rating possible for past performance and received a low risk for relevant experience which is the highest possible rating for experience. Review of the past performance information submitted revealed mixed comments with ratings from satisfactory up to outstanding. A few comments received indicated their performance was exceptional, they are easy to work with, and they would definitely hire them again. It was noted that there were some minor safety incidents. One of the subcontractor's references was contacted, and they indicated the subcontractor delivered a quality product and they followed safety policies and OSHA regulations. However the reference also indicated they had to stay on this subcontractor throughout the performance period to enforce the safety standards. I noticed that the second lowest price offeror was only \$17,250.35 less than a highest rated offeror. With this information I looked closer at the proposal submitted by the lowest price and highest rated offeror. I noticed that the highest rated offeror had performed on numerous projects for a Government agency. Comments received indicated that the contractor is very professional, knowledgeable, and they provide fair and competitive pricing. The contractor is extremely conscious of safety. All sources contacted indicated they would be willing to do business with the offeror in the future. There were no indications of any major safety violations.

In review of the other offers submitted, it was noted that while remaining offerors may have received the same highest possible rating as the third lowest price offeror, they submitted higher prices. Any lower priced offeror received lower ratings. With our selection criteria and the evaluation results, I did not see a significant savings to warrant awarding to any lower priced offeror who received a lower rating for past performance or relevant experience.

Based on the above information I did not see a significant savings to warrant a trade-off with a lower priced offeror having a lower rating in past performance, or to an offeror who had lower ratings for both past performance and relevant experience. The decision to award to the offeror who provided the lowest price and received the highest ratings in both past performance and relevant experience represents the best value to the Government and to Stennis Space Center. Therefore, the offeror with the third lowest price overall, with the lowest price from among the highest rated proposals, submitted by SDVE, LLC is considered both fair and reasonable and the most advantageous for the Government. As a result, award shall be made to SDVE, LLC without discussions in the amount of \$1,056,630.35.

  
Charles J Heim  
Contracting Officer